

Aaron J. Johnson
Plaintiff, pro se
646 West 500 North
Telephone: (202) 819-3814
Email: pentasys@msn.com

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
2019 JUL 25 A 9:41
DISTRICT OF UTAH
BY: DEPUTY CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DISTRICT

AARON J. JOHNSON

PLAINTIFF,
VS.

SALT LAKE CITY, a municipal corporation; Jackie Biskupski, individually and as Mayor; Margaret Plane, individually and as Legal Director; Erin Mendenhall, individually and as 5th District City Councilor and Council Chair; Chris Wharton, individually and as 3rd District Councilor and Council Co-Chair; Brian Fulmer, individually and as assistant to Chris Wharton; Ralph Becker, individually and as former Salt Lake City Mayor; Chris Burbank, individually and as former Salt Lake City Chief of Police; Stan Penfold, individually and as former 3rd District Councilor; Yolanda Francisco-Nez, individually and as director for Salt Lake City Mayor's Office of Diversity & Human Rights; Mathew Rojas, individually and as Director of Communications for the Mayor's Office;

and DOES 1 THROUGH 10

DEFENDANTS

MOTION SEEKING COURT NOTICE OF NEW
VIOLATION IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY INJUNCTION AND
OTHER RELIEF

Case No. 2:18-CV-00467-HCN-CMR

STATEMENT ON NOTICE OF NEW VIOLATION

Concerning this change in policy? Nowhere under the law does Salt Lake's sudden social media policy erase in any way, or sidestep, nor even remotely "moot" defendants' past violations and ITS VIOLATION ON July 19th 2019.

A five-year reign of censorship that authorized a defense of chilling free speech on public forums in the District at taxpayer expense while spouting hollow slogans about inclusivity and equality.

ON JULY 19TH 2019 SALT LAKE "FILTERED OUT" PLAINTIFF'S COMMENTS

Defendants' recently revised social media policy fails to address any of these prior actions whatsoever AND have as evidenced by the Facebook Corporation already committed a new offense of "filtering out comments" on July 19, 2019.

These are demonstrable offenses which continued as Salt Like sought and were granted an extension of time to create and implement a new social media policy; which has now filtered out Plaintiff's comments that remained filtered out while Plaintiff sent email notification to Counsel Brabson (#6500) pointing this discrepancy out.¹ (See attatched exhibit 1).

Plaintiff notified Counsel about the city's "filtering" his comments as a visible removal of Plaintiff's comments as they appeared to the public in Facebook,

¹ Email complaint to Salt Lake Counsel, 23 July 2019, re: To be included by exhibit in the record of this case seeking relief...

"Most Relevant is selected, so some comments may have been filtered out."²

→ C H <https://www.facebook.com/pg/slcCouncil/posts/>

apps G My Account cPanel Login Business News Deal... F How to raise \$16 m... Revolution in Fundr... As...

 Salt Lake City Council  Aaron Home Find

    ...

 Salt Lake City Council   

Want to stay in the know on Council business? , Sign up to receive our email updates! Find out about City projects and resources & events happening in your neighborhood. Sign up here  <https://l.co/My7ID7DYpW>

Salt Lake City Council  

[Home](#) 

[Posts](#)

[Photos](#)

[About](#)

[Twitter](#)

[Videos](#)

[Instagram](#)

[Events](#)   20  2 Comments 1 Share

[Community](#)    

[Email Signup](#)

[Create a Page](#)

Most Relevant 

 Write a comment   

 SLC Mayor 2020 One of the most pressing lawsuits litigated in the 10th circuit court for the District of Utah, concerns the gay leadership of Salt Lake City openly censoring people on its social media pages that knowingly act as the marketplace for democracy.

CENS... [See More](#)

Like Reply 18h

Most Relevant is selected so some comments may have been filtered out

² Facebook displays a public notice on comments which are filtered out.

‘ The response of defendant’s counsel immediately denied the evidenced notification of censorship. Even Facebook provided a visible public notification -- reporting it publicly. Again, see exhibit 1, image 1,

- ***“Most Relevant is selected, so some comments may have been filtered out.”³***

Plaintiff’s constitutionally protected voice in this District continues to be dismissed. My political participation on a site creating a city resolution under color of law about the Mexico Border – a border well outside any sphere of municipal influence or authority and – was again dismissed.

It relates directly to one’s protected political voice in this instance. How are discussions about crime and the Southern Border – in response to the Councils resolutions on illegal immigration – somehow MOOT or remain not relevant or topical to Salt Lakes sanctuary actions as they directly impact public safety?

Why has Salt Lake narrowly defined its political consensus too block outside political voices on matters clearly outside the state of Utah which Salt Lake has no authority over as well? What kind of a suspended reality is taking place in Salt Lake’s leadership that they pass imaginary rules and City Council resolutions without any force or effect or authority of law? Doing so as they also block others voices as defendants made a record of doing for half a decade.

³ Ibid.

That Salt Lake makes— repeatedly - grandiose public edicts while openly denying voice to those deemed out of consensus with contrived, fantasyland dystopic exclusion of political participation committed under color of state law?

I have been directly impacted by illegal immigration as a twice honorably discharged, service-connected injured veteran in this state! I have received lifelong injuries from this impact. Yet illegal residents of Salt like were given more access and voice than Plaintiff as a twice honorably discharged service-connected veteran who self-paid his way into Afghanistan and went to Iraq as a service-connected disabled veteran. The currency of voice in this community is an absolute farce under the current administration.

This plaintiff's voice was censored on this topic at the council; at Mayor Biskupski's office of Diversity and Inclusion the city labeled "Human Rights Commission" where censorship to legal residents occurred on ALL topics for half a decade in some cases. What self-serving clutch of deluded, grandiose, indifferent representatives get away with that?

That's what Salt Lake City asked this court to abide and MOOT and comport with because after five years of doing exactly this - Salt Lake now" promises" to do better in the face of delayed consequence?

Plaintiff places this on the record, preserving it for appeal in the case the District court allows this to continue; or does not provide just relief commensurate with what these defendants knowingly have done and with an indifference reserved for the basest form of elected leadership.

Defendant Salt Lake City is a mega-rich corporation. Money is both the principle it operates under and which it openly speaks. According to Salt Lake's Comprehensive Annual

Financial Report (CAFR), they run over \$2 million dollars a day through their cash registers - \$750 million dollars annually.

They are the richest city in Utah, lording this over the citizens of this state with extensive public and private litigation making those within its sphere of influence comply in a vast, far reaching campaign outside even the city limits. By comparison, the second largest earner in the District of Utah is Sandy City at \$92 million.

Salt Lake receives federal funding contingent upon a known, sworn, adherence to federal rules, laws and admittedly – the Bill of Rights as enforceable to Salt Lake under the Incorporation Clause of the Fourteenth amendment since at least 1952.

When private citizens and corporations violate the law in Salt Lake, the government of Salt Lake holds violators accountable with economic consequences.

When the Facebook Corporation violated the privacy of its user base, it was the Federal Government imposing economic consequences on Facebook to direct compliance with US Law in protection of private citizens. Salt Lake, just as the United States Government levies economic consequences against the violative behaviors to impede violations of law which are ignored with indifference.

Salt Lakes course correction by policy – a complete revision yet to be produced – believes it may evade lawful injunction, declaration for past offenses or damages under a failed theory offered to MOOT this case and the 5-year history of denied equality in this District.

Nothing in the evidence before this court remotely demonstrates Salt Lake has ever sought to correct its unlawful, unconstitutional actions as a correction of social media policy prior to Plaintiff's request for injunction occurring more than a year after this case was filed in the District.

Salt Like does more than levy fines as an economic consequence. It uses the Courts to compel restorative process when fines are not paid.

If Salt Lake City conducted the business of government as it seeks to in this court and didn't enforce its hundreds of ordinances with economic consequences, the conduct they seek to impede with fines and legal action would be largely ignored. Why does Salt Lake seek a resolution beyond any known reciprocity concerning its own conduct?

This city violated in spades what are clearly established laws without any consequence whatsoever. Defendants then sought in its briefs a continued avoidance of all lawfully imposed consequences in its admitted five-year censoring actions – seeking to avoid lawful prospective relief allowable under the law as a remedy this court can provide as both an injunction and a declaratory judgement.

There is no settlement of this case. Salt lake's ongoing indifference to these actions remained without consequence of any type – now seeking to further avoid any consequence for this history?

Plaintiff is not willing to overlook Salt Lake's blatant violations as a face-saving suspension of reality in what was done.

What measure of justness has been advanced in this District concerning Salt Lake's indifference to an abusive administration which limited and withheld equality for all based upon trendy idealisms used to chum the United Nations!

PLAINTIFF STATEMENT CONCERNING THE DISTRICT'S INACTION

The court system is designed to implement and administer justice. How has this process been just or equitable when the court, made aware of these violations, does not act.

Defendants violations have been a five-year battle censoring his core-political speech? I am very concerned about the lack of justness in this District as it directly impacts First Amendment Speech and it is done as ancillary violations of the Fourteenth amendment when First Amendment rights were chilled and taken away. Yet a prose complaint doesn't rise to the level of notice regardless of the encompassing protections of these liberty interests.

When Plaintiff's briefs comport to a legal standard of civil process, there is no result. Brining this case has been an exercise in futility, discouraging ordinary citizens of any vindication of civil rights in the District of Utah. This process has disabused me of any notion of prevailing on the merits of this case or the known record of defendants admitted violations.

Not only is a bias palpable for non-attorneys – this case demonstrates the District of Utah has allowed these defendants to act above and against protected liberty interests when the law on the issues of flora analysis and core political speech as they proscribe censorship are clearly established. The bias establishes a privilege for Salt like and its colleagues to act without consequence or accountability.

Salt Lake politicized a record of civil rights compliance which this District is hesitant to correct by injunction or condemn under declaratory writ.

'it is well known in this District – and by those like Hart and Holland and a wide-ranging network of legal colleagues Salt Like relied upon in seeking international attention to HOST the 68th annual United Nations Civil Society conference. Does this play directly into this courts reluctance to act as a face saving measure for the City of Salt Lake itself, its legal and professional reputation and how ruling on Plaintiffs case reflects poorly on Salt Lake in the District as the host city to the United Nations.

Few things are more emasculating to a Plaintiff – wondering if the Districts inaction is a method to ignore plaintiff's protected liberty interests as a pro se plaintiff because what's at stake. That these purported "constitutional rights" appear to fail, have little merit in this District in the face of hosting the United Nations – the possible loss of face, embarrassment and inability to provide protected political speech and equality now exceeding five years.

Because Salt Lake City is hosting the United Nations – has this case purposely stalled? The politics of being no one in this District is humiliating. It rubs offense at everything any promise of America offered the small and inconsequential people unable to afford a vindication of rights.

The reality today is Salt Lake is widely known to have chummed the United Nations with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints bringing the United Nations to Salt Lake City. Too showcase Utah to the world as some mythical protector of freedoms as Salt Lake ignored the US Constitution as well the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; this declaration's Preamble

decries the same base form of censorship Salt Lake committed against Plaintiff's political voice that Salt Lake defendants have both engaged in and admitted on the record of this case.⁴

While has this court not tasked these defendant's in the face of what they have knowingly leveraged to the world with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints? This case is highly political. The corporation of the Church as comprised has been noting more than a reach around record in every procedure where its own objectives are at stake.

Postpone a ruling and pretending to moot a half decade of violations cannot be ameliorated with Salt Lakes revised social media policy.

Who in this court does not know mayor Biskupski understands the stakes? That despite these stakes, Salt Lake forcefully defended their chilling of political speech as censorship on the record of this proceeding – engaging in those actions and other violations for half a decade in the District of Utah without any consequence – and during the entire term of her office and while chumming the United Nations with The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

In fact, Salt Lake's administration as led by Mayor Biskupski and Salt lake's legal director Margaret Plane knowingly buried these issues under a willful smothering of bureaucratic indifference knowing they would reach out to the United Nations with The Corporation of the

⁴ See exhibit 2, Declaration proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December 1948 (General Assembly resolution 217 A) as a common standard of achievements for all peoples and all nations.

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints to host the first ever international conference held outside of New York City!

Knowing all tis these defendants at no time altered their course of actions or their violative behaviors whatsoever! Why? Because this city, this state and its administration and politics smothers free speech – smothers access, denies equality and robustly interferes in civil process as the status quo

How is it just Salt Lake can levy fines and drag residents through civil and criminal process when its sensibilities are offended? When its laws and ordinances are broken – yet the same guarantee of reciprocal process in the District of Utah concerning an Article III case in controversy arising under constitutional violations born in defendants political bias and unequal treatment can be ignored when it suits these defendants?

That voice – any one's voice in this District - is marginalized like this Plaintiff's for five years without consequence and whose accountability – if it ever arrives – is delayed as a political expediency to comport with an outside foreign entity like the United Nations?

Unlike Salt Lake, I am not here to appease the legal community in this District who poo-pooed these known ongoing violations. Violations arising under a federal question as an Article III cause in controversy while defendant Salt Lake City busily waived a colorful banner of inclusion and equality for all in knowingly restricting the political voices of individuals contrary to what Salt Lake's was offering a larger class of residents. Equality? Where's the laugh track?

Salt Lakes faux policies on equality and inclusion demonstrably failed, miserably. Not only am I the casualty in its faux democracy under Mayor Biskupksi's administration and legal

department as administered by Margaret Plane – this case can not sidestep what's been done as some face-saving magic bullet for its administration or its network of sycophantic colleagues who gainfully watched this spectacle unfold from the sidelines as they waived Salt Lake's same banner in seeking international attention to host the United Nations.

This case isn't brought to cover up the mistakes of these state actors who worked with The Corporation of the Church as it occurred – has that been Salt Lake's planned defense – to politically erase its known history of censorship already pled in this case [ECF No. 33].⁵

Salt Lake's defense ALSO castigated Plaintiff's sexual orientation on the record of this proceeding [ECF No. 33] incorporated by reference and inclusion pursuant fed. R. Civ. P 10(c) - because I dared sue these defendants proclaiming the falsity of their inclusivity they denied this Plaintiff which if hadn't denied a larger class of residents.

This case is not brought to aid Salt Lake's administration save face for the sullied reputations within its administration who have been able to exit, Like defendant Plane, without any consequence; suspending the reality of how, when and what defendant's presided over under color of law authority without consequence for five years. Hasn't that been Salt Lakes defense to date?

⁵ "Under the Pseudonym Aaron Jones, Plaintiff Aaron Johnson has been banned from commenting on a number of Facebook pages administered by the city".³ [ECF No. 33]

"On October 23, 2014, Aaron Jones was banned from commenting on the Salt Lake City Council Facebook page"⁴ [ECF No. 33]

"On February 5, 2017, Aaron Jones was banned from commenting on the City's Human Rights Commission Facebook page."⁵ [ECF No. 33]

A defense asking this court to suspend process, to delay decision, too overlook what's been done under defendant's promise to "do better in the future" as some vague, over reaching, broadly worded social media policy only now materializing after five years of vigorously defending its unabated censorship.

Defendants have misrepresented their actions of censorship. This misrepresentation is viewale in the record of this court, to the United Nations, and the Salt Lake Tribune which reprinted this city's censorship to the entire nation as demonstrable.

Defendants proposed July 2019 correction to its social media policy [ECF No. 54-2] is an admission of violations because it seeks to correct its unlawful constitutionally deficient policy by court notice [ECF No. 54]. Defendants policy correction arrived only after facing Plaintiff's Emergency Request for injunction as the United Nations Civil Conference date closed in.

I can only imagine the tremendous pressure defendants have place upon this court and community in seeking to dismiss this Article III case in trying to falsely represent itself to the international community.

Only recently [ECF No. 54-2] have these defendants changed course after mounting a 5-year vigorous defense in justifying censorship with an unlawful, illegal deficient policy spanning a half-decade in violation of the constitution. Defendant's actions are an absolute smugness and indifference to others protected liberty interests.

WINK WINK IN THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

How in the District is this anything but repugnant to one's sense of justness? That these defendant would ask this court to delay and abide its demonstrable 5-year history of censorship because defendants' only after 5 years – now promise to do better? That while defendants' busily sought to host the United Nations with the assistance of the Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter day Saints their actions knowingly failed to adhere to policies condemning censorship within the United nations own Declaration of Human rights.

What political expediency seeks District approval in these actions? What banana republic is this that Salt lake's violations and The Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Days Saints have their personal expediencies now overlooked in a court of law established to right the balance of Constitutional inequity as an established historical policy of the United States?

This defense ploy seeking to stall and safeguarding some defendants reputations as outgoing actors who authorized this admitted 5-year suspense of Plaintiff's political voice? This political posturing is abhorrent

These defendants know the August 24th 2019 date set to host the 68th annual United Nations conference approaches. Instead of settling this case, defendants instead have sought to and counted on this District to dismiss this Article III case as a triviality and inconvenience to them because its violations didn't fit into the fake narrative Salt Lake and the Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was selling the United Nations and the international community in seeking this conference.

This case is really about what are constitutionally protected liberty interests as the First and Fourteenth Amendments in this Country. *It is not about Salt Lake's Bananastan administration getting a pass on violating the Constitution and protected liberty interests in the District of Utah.*

The complained of violation concerns core-protected-speech as the exact element and nature of a known violation. One clearly established under constitutional guarantees enforceable to the States - all United States in including the District of Utah. I have been cheated of these guarantees because Utah is holding up one set of principles to the nation such as the United Nations as color of state law actors used non-governmental entities to help them manage violations inconsistent with their public face. These rights in this District have not been protected.

This case began with an outline of a five year history of violation. NOW – a NEW violation has occurred on Juoly19th 2019 as the court allowed these defendants extension of time in which these defendants have then failed to implement a policy protecting speech AND which was challenged and remains demonstrably defective on its face [ECF No. 54-2].

The delay and the new offense during the delay are yet to face consequence.

Why do these defendants – any of them - rewarded under the status quo of their political bias? The political administration of Jackie Biskuposki? The legal direction of Salt Lake's legal department as a civil rights trope?

That in this District, these defendants do visibly remain above the same laws as President Donald Trump and others. That this lack of consequence and accountability refused to provide any form of lawful accountability as prospective relief long after the law in multiple Districts is

decisively drawn? That censorship at the Utah Attorney Generals;’ office decried ion case 2:18-CV-00029 continues and exceeds seven years is a slap in the face to the Constitutional precepts of this country that knowingly occurs in this District! What kind of special club is this which a citizens rights cannot be vindicated unless a member of some special legal club is selected to vindicate those rights?

These defendants’ actions are the fly in the jelly of democracy! Defendants’ reliance on a special local club of attorneys to safeguard their position in the community – even while actively violating others rights – is the cesspool of inequality.

Defendant’s actions, their behaviors, are reliant upon this legal community in seeking to dismiss any accountability whatsoever. The joke is on those Plaintiff’s whose ideals of liberty are out of consensus with the local club. This is how Salt Lake avoids consequence in the a 10th Circuit Ct. Their political bias is shared within the local club – one seeking consensus and failing to act for those they have political bias and enmity toward.

WHEREFORE:

Plaintiff makes notice to this court of new violation in seeking all available forms of allowable relief. Without economic consequences in this case, these defendants and others in this District of Utah will continue to chill speech in violation of the First Amendments Free Exercise Clause. Administration acting under color of state law will exercise political bias in blocking access to public forums, e.g., Twitter and Facebook acting as some of the most important marketplaces in democracy today.

These actors Utah's the political climate guarantees that Utah will continue to violate and chill free speech in the absence of economic consequences attached.

That this motion be reviewed by an Article III Judge.

Thursday, July 25, 2019

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Aaron Johnson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Aaron" on the top line and "Johnson" on the bottom line, both ending in a flourish.

Aaron Johnson

Plaintiff, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that on Thursday, July 25, 2019, I filed the foregoing MOTION SEEKING COURT NOTICE OF NEW VIOLATION IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY INJUNCTION AND OTHER RELIEF with the Clerk of the Court.

I also certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was placed in outgoing US Mail, postage prepaid, to the following counsel of record; and/or hand delivered to Salt Lake City Corporation legal department's counsel of record:

Salt Lake City Corporation
Legal Department / Catharine Brabson
451 South State Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-3104



Aaron Johnson

Plaintiff Pro Se

EXHIBIT ONE:

From: Mr. AJ <pentasys@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2019 12:53 PM
To: Brabson, Catherine <Catherine.Brabson@slcgov.com>
Cc: utdefc_nielson@utd.uscourts.gov; utdefc_romero@utd.uscourts.gov
Subject: case 2:18-CV-00467 Salt Lake Defendants extension of time and new offenses after granting access

23 July 2019

Ms. Brabson:

CC: utdefc_nielson@utd.uscourts.gov <utdefc_nielson@utd.uscourts.gov>;
utdefc_romero@utd.uscourts.gov <utdefc_romero@utd.uscourts.gov>;

To be included by exhibit in the record of this case seeking relief...

Evidently Salt Lake City Council isn't waiting for the legal departments court request to adopt a new social media policy "allowing" Plaintiff Aaron Johnson back on the Council's Facebook site. The Court granted Salt Lake City Corporation a three-week extension of time to formulate, promulgate, vote on and adopt a revised social media policy. In the interim – the council of its own accord opened the city council site. Allegedly – doing so from pressure after it received feedback from a national coalition against censorship in DC aligned with LGBT issues.

Counsel Brabson, you specifically informed the court by motion that the Council's revised policy would "MOOT" this case. And despite the court's anticipated revised social media policy of the Council – which has yet to be either fully detailed to this court let alone be filed under this extension of time granted these defendants – the Council has ALREADY opened the City Council Facebook page AND ***removed comments by the Plaintiff which he posted anonymously as SLC MAYOR 2020***.

The removal of Plaintiff's comments appears in Facebook and are described as,

"Most Relevant is selected, so some comments may have been filtered out."

This council as defendant is visibly "filtering out content". This is an act of continued censorship consistent with Plaintiff's original and amended Plead [ECF No. 24]. Defendant's continue

blocking 1st amendment speech without any 14th amendment due process or equal protection contrary to the already proposed social media policy filed in this court.

- It goes against every representation of defendants proposed and revised policy submitted to the court [ECF No, 54-2] seeking and subsequently granted an extension of time.

For the court as it relates directly to one's protected political voice – how are discussions of crime by this Plaintiff – in response to the Councils resolutions on illegal immigration not relevant or topical to Salt Lakes sanctuary actions as the directly impact public safety? Why is Salt Lake able to narrowly define political consensus? I have been directly impacted by illegal immigration as a twice honorably discharged, service-connected injured veteran in this state!

Bowing to outside pressure instead of the US Constitution

Defendant Salt Lake City continues to do whatever they want whenever it suits them. These defendants recently opened its public forum at the City Council Facebook pages. Yet demonstrably here - when criticism was presented about the censorship of this city to a national gay alliance group in DC concerning the City's ongoing censorship – the forum was then opened despite what Counsel Brabson represented in [ECF No. 54] to this court.

- My concern as a Plaintiff and city resident s why had it failed to open the public forums of the city pursuant the rule of law, stare decisis precedent or constitutional concerns surrounding protected First amendment core-political speech!

Defendants have now – despite bowing to outside peer political pressure outside of the 10th Cir. Ct., filtered out content (censored core-political speech) concerning Salt Lake's crime problems on a post the Council posted July 18th at 4:50 PM on the Council Facebook page as,

"the Council passed a ceremonial resolution with Mayor Jackie Biskupski condemning the treatment of migrants at the southern border, and called upon Federal leaders to take a humane course of action to address this humanitarian crisis"

This latest censorship offense is provided here as an inline and attached image file "censor check SLC council 19 July 2019.PNG". it "filtered out comments" I posted under a pseudonym of SLC Mayor 2020 under my political voice seeking office in Salt Lake.

- Mrs. Brabson – my comments about the known rape culture Salt Lake is experiencing were removed in this July 19 at 1:27 PM post at Salt Lake City Council's Facebook page. It is a new offense. It speaks directly to the disingenuous nature of these defendants acting above the same laws President Trump was held to in both the original and appellate court cases in the S.D.N.Y.

This is political bias. It is chilling free speech on behalf of those on the City Council – named defendants Wharton & Mendenhall – seeking either political office or assisting others evade the same set of rules even a sitting US President is subject to.

Counsel Brabson (#6500) I will continue to seek every form of prospective relief available in the court as well as damages. Defendant Salt Lake City is incapable of allowing free expression as core-political speech in the District of Utah. Without significant economic consequences – Salt Lake City will continue – as clearly evidenced here – ***act as the political bully of free speech in this District of Utah!***

Happy Pioneer Day Mrs. Brabson,

Mr. Johnson

Plaintiff Pro Se

Case 2:18-CV-00467 in the District of Utah.

BCC: DOJ

→ C Home https://www.facebook.com/pg/slcCouncil/posts/


My Account cPanel Login Business News Dad... How to raise \$16 m... Revolution in Fundr... Ask

Salt Lake City Council  Aaron Home Find

 Like Follow Share ...

Salt Lake City Council  July 19 at 1:27 PM 

Want to stay in the know on Council business?  Sign up to receive our email updates! Find out about City projects and resources & events happening in your neighborhood. Sign up here  <https://l.co/My7ID7DYpW>

Salt Lake City Council   [@slcCouncil](https://www.facebook.com/slcCouncil)

Home Posts Photos About Twitter Videos Instagram Events Community Email Signup 

 20  2 Comments  1 Share

 Like  Comment  Share 

Most Relevant 

 Write a comment.   

 **SLC Mayor 2020** One of the most pressing lawsuits litigated in the 10th circuit court for the District of Utah, concerns the gay leadership of Salt Lake City openly censoring people on its social media pages that knowingly act as the marketplace for democracy

CENS... [See More](#)

Like Reply 18h

Most Relevant is selected so some comments may have been filtered out

C H https://www.facebook.com/pg/slcCouncil/posts/

G My Account cPanel Login B Business News D... F How to raise \$16 m... Revolution in Fundr... As

Salt Lake City Council Aaron Home Find

 Like Follow Share ...

219 Views

SLCgov 15 hrs 

Like Page

Summer in SLC is in full swing. Check out all of what's happening on this week's Capital City News Brief starting with FREE Mondays in the Park concerts, a Pro See More

Salt Lake City Council  

@slcCouncil

Home Posts Photos About Twitter Videos Instagram Events Community Email Signup Create a Page

Like Comment Share

Most Relevant 

 Write a comment   

 Aaron Jones Salt Lake's leadership as comprised at the Council is woefully deficient. We've elected some of the least qualified people. Some would call them balloons, or worse!

The council throws out a blip styled add on numerous topics as it refuses to address the concerns of citizens like some non-stop laugh track. On the topic posted here in your animated blip - "talking to a cop" series. Here's a REPEAT of a post you already "filtered" out as my first entry under Aaron Jones. It's a standing constitutional challenge to the princess fragility represented by this council. The COuncil's unexpected reversal of its constitutional violations will NOT stop the seeking of a Declaration in the Federal Court Case 2:18-CV-00467

Examining failed leadership. We have the leadership we elected and its been a violent, off the hook Rape Mecca - 5X higher than the national average.

https://youtu.be/uZ2_KxuGVeY

 YOUTUBE.COM
Rape Mecca

Like Reply Remove Preview 1m



SLC Mayor 2020

24 mins

...

One of the most pressing lawsuits litigated in the 10th circuit court for the District of Utah, concerns the gay leadership of Salt Lake City openly censoring people on its social media pages that knowingly act as the marketplace for democracy.

CENSORSHIP occurred at SLCPD while they advertised a free speech Zone protest, the City Council pretentiously soliciting itself as the voice of the people, and its Human Rights forum espousing "diversity and inclusion" while knowingly excluding resident's voices because their voices didn't regurgitate a sameness of consensus.

That is the textbook definition of a failed Fantasyland.

Either Salt Lake are the Neo-Nazi arm of queerdom in this nation, or its censorship doesn't fit with the progressive Narrative of the LGBT movement in this country?

As the plaintiff in that lawsuit, Clearly they're a bunch of cry-baby schlocks who criticize others political voices but won't allow their own 'color of state law' behavior to be criticized in the public square!

And I pointedly add, those involved in Utah's marriage Equality Act, then stood in solidarity with Salt Lake City as it censored people on social media and in some cases - that censorship exceeded five years! AND disparaged others sexual orientation as a government body in defense of their censorship!

When you fuck-up that badly, go big. Salt Lake City certainly has!

